

APPEAL NO. 030690
FILED JUNE 16, 2003

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on December 10, 2002, and February 18, 2003. The record closed on February 18, 2003. The hearing officer determined that appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury and that she did not have disability. Claimant appealed these determinations on sufficiency grounds. Respondent (carrier) responded that the Appeals Panel should affirm the hearing officer's decision and order. Respondent also raised the Appeals Panel's jurisdiction and questioned whether the appeal was timely, whether it was a sufficient appeal, and whether service on carrier affected jurisdiction.

DECISION

We affirm.

Carrier questions whether claimant's appeal was timely, stating that it was not if the envelope from the claimant was postmarked after March 26, 2003. The envelope was postmarked March 18, 2003, and the appeal was timely. Carrier contends that the Appeals Panel does not have jurisdiction over the appeal because the appeal was not properly served on carrier. The failure of the appellant to properly serve the respondent with a copy of the appeal does not affect the timeliness of the appeal, but extends the time to respond. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 92051, decided April 30, 1992; Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 94101, decided March 8, 1994.

Carrier alleges that the claimant's request for review, which states that if she does not receive benefits, she appeals the decision, fails to invoke the jurisdiction of the Appeals Panel because it fails to rebut the decision of the hearing officer. No particular form of appeal is required and an appeal, even though terse or inartfully worded, will be considered. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 91131, decided February 12, 1992. Appeals which lack specificity will be treated as attacks on the sufficiency of the evidence. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 92081, decided April 14, 1992. We consider claimant's appeal an attack on the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the hearing officer's resolution of the only two interrelated issues that were decided adversely to her--the issues of injury and disability.

We have reviewed the complained-of determinations and conclude that the issues involved fact questions for the hearing officer. The hearing officer reviewed the record and decided what facts were established. We conclude that the hearing officer's determinations are supported by the record and are not so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

We affirm the hearing officer's decision and order.

According to information provided by carrier, the true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **AMCOMP ASSURANCE CORPORATION** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY
800 BRAZOS STREET, SUITE 330
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701.**

Judy L. S. Barnes
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Chris Cowan
Appeals Judge

Veronica Lopez-Ruberto
Appeals Judge